

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 6, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 3 and 6 are hereby amended. Claim 20 is hereby cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-19 and 21-40 are currently pending. Claims 1-9, 19, and 21-28 are examined and claims 10-18 and 29-40 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the examined claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0022634 to Chung et al. (hereinafter "Chung") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,879,359 to Kikkawa et al. (hereinafter "Kikkawa"). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Chung and Kikkawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,140 to Kubo et al. (hereinafter "Kubo").

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 19 and 21 as being unpatentable over Chung in view of Kikkawa is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over Chung in view of Kikkawa in that claim 1 now recites "the pixel electrode includes a first transparent pixel electrode and a second transparent pixel electrode, the first transparent pixel electrode is disposed between the black matrix and the color filter and contacts the drain electrode, and the second transparent pixel electrode is on the pixel electrode to contact the first transparent pixel electrode." This limitation was previously recited in claim 20. Claim 20, now cancelled, was indicated in the last Office Action as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Chung in view of Kikkawa does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and claims 2, 5, 8, 19 and 21, which depend therefrom, are allowable over Chung in view of Kikkawa.

The rejection of claim 9 as being unpatentable over Chung in view of Kikkawa, in further view of Kubo is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests “the pixel electrode includes a first transparent pixel electrode and a second transparent pixel electrode, the first transparent pixel electrode is disposed between the black matrix and the color filter and contacts the drain electrode, and the second transparent pixel electrode is on the pixel electrode to contact the first transparent pixel electrode,” as recited in independent claim 1. As stated above, this limitation was indicated in the last Office Action as containing allowable subject matter. For at least these reasons, claim 9, which depends from claim 1, is allowable over the cited references.

Also, in the Office Action, claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claim 1 is herein amended to include the limitations of claim 20 and claim 20 is herein cancelled. Furthermore, claims 3 and 6 are herein amended and are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 depends from claim 3 and claim 7 depends from claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection to claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 20.


Claims 22-28 were indicated as allowed in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicant believes that with the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant